

1 JEFFREY D. WOHL (Cal. State Bar No. 96838)  
2 PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP  
3 55 Second Street, 24th Floor  
4 San Francisco, California 94105  
5 Telephone: (415) 856-7000  
6 Facsimile: (415) 856-7100  
7 [jeffwohl@paulhastings.com](mailto:jeffwohl@paulhastings.com)

8 STEPHEN H. HARRIS (Cal. State Bar No. 184608)  
9 PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP  
10 515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071  
12 Telephone: (213) 683-6000  
13 Facsimile: (213) 627-0705  
14 [stephenharris@paulhastings.com](mailto:stephenharris@paulhastings.com)

15 Attorneys for Defendant  
16 Los Alamos National Security, LLC

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL AND  
20 TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES, CWA  
21 LOCAL 9119, AFL-CIO; RICHARD  
22 MONTOYA; CATHERINE CHAPMAN;  
23 THOMAS MARKS; and MANUEL  
24 TRUJILLO,

25 Plaintiffs/Petitioners,

26 vs.

27 BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE  
28 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA; LOS  
29 ALAMOS NATIONAL SECURITY, LLC;  
30 and DOES 1 TO 40, inclusive,

31 Defendants/Respondents

32 No. C-06-03326-SBA

33 **STIPULATION AND ORDER SETTING  
34 BRIEFING AND HEARING SCHEDULE FOR  
35 PARTIES' CROSS-MOTIONS AND RESETTING  
36 CASE MANAGEMENT DATES**

## STIPULATION

Plaintiffs University Professional and Technical Employees, CWA Local 9119, AFL-CIO; Richard Montoya; Catherine Chapman; Thomas Marks; and Manual Trujillo, and defendants The Regents of the University of California and Los Alamos National Security, LLC, acting through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. This action was commenced in California Superior Court, Alameda County (the  
“Superior Court”), on April 18, 2006, and removed to this Court on May 19, 2006.

2. Defendants' response to plaintiffs' complaint was due on June 19, 2006.

3. On May 31, 2006, plaintiffs e-filed a First Amended Complaint.

4. Plaintiffs intend to move to remand this action to the Superior Court. Defendants intend to bring motions to dismiss the First Amended Complaint.

5. After conferring, the parties wish to coordinate the scheduling of their respective motions to avoid conflicts with the Court's hearing availability and their calendars.

6. Accordingly, the parties have agreed and respectfully request that the Court approve the following briefing and hearing schedule for their respective motions:

July 28, 2006: Plaintiffs to e-file their motion to remand.

Defendants to e-file their motions to dismiss (the due date for defendants' response to plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint would be extended to this date)

August 25, 2006: Parties to e-file their oppositions to the pending motions

September 12, 2006: Parties to e-file their replies in support of their respective motions.

September 26, 2006: Hearing on parties' respective motions (1:00 p.m.)

7. Because these motions should be decided before the parties embark on case management proceedings, the parties further have agreed and respectfully request that the Court reset the case management dates previously set in this action as follows:

111

111

111

November 2, 2006: Last day for parties to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR processes, and discovery; last day for parties to file ADR certification and either stipulation to ADR process or notice of need for ADR telephone conference

November 22, 2006: Last day for parties to complete their initial disclosures or state objections in Rule 26(f) report, file case management statement and Rule 26(f) report

December 4, 2006: Initial case management conference (3:00 p.m.)

8. By entering into this stipulation, the parties do not waive any objection, claim, or defense they may have.

Dated: June \_\_\_, 2006.

PETER W. SALTZMAN  
ARTHUR A. KRANTZ  
LEONARD CARDER, LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Arthur A. Krantz  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
University Professional and Technical Employees,  
CWA Local 9119, AFL-CIO; Richard Montoya;  
Catherine Chapman; Thomas Marks; and  
Manual Trujillo

Dated: June \_\_\_, 2006.

MARY C. OPPEDAHL  
REED SMITH LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mary C. Oppedahl  
Attorneys for Defendant  
The Regents of the University of California

1  
2 Dated: June \_\_\_, 2006.  
3

JEFFREY D. WOHL  
STEPHEN H. HARRIS  
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

4 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
5 Jeffrey D. Wohl  
6 Attorneys for Defendant  
7 Los Alamos National Security, Inc.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## ORDER

Based on the parties' stipulation, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS ORDERED that the Court adopts the following briefing and hearing schedule for the parties' planned motions to remand and to dismiss, and resets case management proceedings, as follows:

July 28, 2006: Plaintiffs to e-file their motion to remand.

Defendants to e-file their motions to dismiss (the due date for defendants' response to plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint is hereby extended to this date)

August 25, 2006: Parties to e-file their oppositions to the pending motions

September 12, 2006: Parties to e-file their replies in support of their respective motions.

September 26, 2006: Hearing on parties' respective motions (1:00 p.m.)

November 2, 2006: Last day for parties to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR processes, and discovery; last day for parties to file ADR certification and either stipulation to ADR process or notice of need for ADR telephone conference

November 22, 2006: Last day for parties to complete their initial disclosures or state objections in Rule 26(f) report, file case management statement and Rule 26(f) report

December 4, 2006: Initial case management conference set for **2:30 p.m.**, via telephone. Plaintiff's counsel is to set up the conference call with all the parties on the line and call chambers at (510) 637-3559.

Dated: June 12, 2006.

*Saundra B. Armstrong*  
Saundra Brown Armstrong  
United States District Judge